Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED

(1)

No. 01 11 56 FEB - 8 2002

In The

supreme court of The united States of America

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

"In re case number:01C50399 as of October 29th, 2001-A.D."

"In re." Larry- Dean: Kallembach as the de jure-national of the Wisconsin (Wisconsinite)

"In re." Darrel- Lee: Kallembach as the de jure-national of the Wisconsin (Wisconsinite)

v. Petitioner(s),

James Warsaw d/b/a president

Barbara Hinshaw d/b/a senior escrow agent

Respondent(s),

On the petition **de novo** for The interlocutory appeal for the injunctive relief "In re SUPREME COURT RULE 20.1" & by the act of congress "In re June 25, 1948, ch.646, 62 Stat. 928" "In re Aug. 12, 1976, Pub. L. 94-381, 3, 90 Stat. 1119" "In re Senate Report 94-204" by **the principle of the law** from the UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS IN THE WESTERN DIVISION in its principal place of business in D.C. CORPORATION

"In re... between a State and citizens of another State... in the article III sec. 2 of the Constitution for The United States of America"

On The Petition **de novo** for an "In re Extraordinary writ of mandamus/ prohibition" "In re SUPREME COURT RULE 20.1, .2 &.3" and by the act of congress "In re June 25, 1948, ch.646, 62 Stat. 944" **by the principle of the law**

Mark- A. Stefanski, agent/deponent
"In re SUPREME COURT RULE 29.3"
Non-federal/domestic territory
[North 5403- County Road E]
Iron Ridge, Wisconsin in the united States of America
(414) 418-3919

49 pp

QUESTIONS PRESENTED i

1. Have the agents including the STATE BAR NUMBERS and assigns of the STATE OF WISCONSIN **in the breach** and **in the violation** of The CORPORATE By- Laws and contracts i.e. The Acts of Congress, Constitution of the United States of America in disregarding their PRIVATE contract with the UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT also The Wisconsin constitution on the May 29th , 1848 nunc pro tunc by the peoples in denying access in the state court and federal court for redress of The grievances by the de jure nationals of The Wisconsin (Wisconsinites) without any representation whatsoever in the de facto STATE OF WISCONSIN i.e. the sec. 2 of the fourteenth amendment State it's a CRIME, REBELLION, and TREASON as the registered voters in voting in any election "In re June 25, 1948, ch.646, 62 Stat. 928" ?
2. Are the agents, including STATE BAR NUMBERS, and assigns of STATE OF WISCONSIN and STATE OF ILLINOIS **in the breach** and **in the violation** of the sec. 3 of the fourteenth amendment denying access for a Three-judge court when an action is filed challenging the constitutionality of the apportionment of congressional districts "In re June 25, 1948, ch.646, 62 Stat. 968"?
3. Does the Congress have exclusive power for regulating **interstate commerce** i.e. Wisconsin republic state of the nation under international law and/or foreign states, agents, STATE BAR NUMBERS, assigns of STATE OF WISCONSIN i.e. **commercial activities** any "agency or instrumentality of a foreign state" in the UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT can access , lay & collect taxes also immunity from jurisdiction of United States courts "In re Pub. L. 94-583, sec. 4(a), Oct. 21, 1976, 90 Stat. 2892"?
4. Dose The supreme court of the united States of America have original jurisdiction in all actions or proceedings by a State against the citizens of another State "In re Public Law,15 United States at Large, Chapter 249, pgs.223-224 (1868)"?

LIST OF THE PARTIES ii

[X] A list of all parties in the proceedings by the court whose order is subject of this petition de novo is as follows:

Ron Georgeson d/b/a president
David A. Kenple d/b/a president
Robert S. Duxstad d/b/a attorney/state bar number
Daniel Bestul d/b/a attorney/state bar number
Doug Timmerman d/b/a president
Jeffery J. Landsman d/b/a attorney/state bar number
James E. Doyle d/b/a attorney general/state bar number
Rick G. Chandler, Cate S. Zeske d/b/a secretary of revenue
Jo-Ann Millhouse d/b/a corporation counsel/state bar number
Robert P. Van De Hey d/b/a judge/state bar number
Diane Perkins d/b/a court clerk
Marilyn Pierce d/b/a register of deeds
Chris Carl d/b/a clerk
William D. Johnston d/b/a judge/state bar number
Catherine M. McGowan d/b/a court clerk
Steve Bechtolt d/b/a president
Linda L. Bawden d/b/a clerk
Todd W. Schluche d/b/a attorney/state bar number
Philip G. Reinhard d/b/a chief judge/state bar number
P. Michael Mahoney d/b/a judge/state bar number
Wayne Anderson d/b/a judge/state bar number
Cornelia G. Clark d/b/a clerk
Shirley S. Abrahamson d/b/a chief justice/state bar number
William A. Bablitch d/b/a justice/state bar number
Jon P. Wilcox d/b/a justice/state bar number
Ann Walsh Bradley d/b/a justice /state bar number
N. Patrick Crooks d/b/a justice/state bar number
David T. Prosseser d/b/a justice/state number
Diane Sykes d/b/a justice/state bar number
James R. Beer d/b/a judge/attorney/state bar number
undisclosed agents, STATE BAR NUMBERS and assigns
of the "agency or instrumentality of a foreign state"

Respondents

Table of Contents iii

Questions Presented..... i

Listings of the parties..... ii

Table of Contents..... iii

Table of Authorities .....iv, v

Orders Below..... 2

Jurisdiction.....2

Constitution and Statutory Provisions Involved...11

Statement of issues.....13

Judicial Notice: oath's of office..... 17

Ultimate facts.....18

Reasons for the Granting of the 25
writ mandamus/ prohibition

Injunctive Relief and Relief sought.....27

INDEX FOR THE APPENDICES

APPENDIX: A

APPENDIX: B
APPENDIX: C
APPENDIX: D
APPENDIX: E
APPENDIX: F

Table of Authorities iv

Cases by the principle of the law

Coury v. Prot, 85 F 3rd 244, 248 (5th Cir 1996)
Doe v. Blue Shield United, 112 F.3rd 869 (7th Cir. 1997)
Finley v. U.S., 490 545, 548-49, 109 S. Ct. 2003, 2006 (1989)
Strawbridge v. Curtiss, 7U.S. (3 Cranch) 267 (1806)

Statutes

SUPREME COURT RULE 29.3
SUPREME COURT RULE 20.1, .2 & .3 1
FRE 201(d), (e),(f).....1
FRE 202 1
FRE 203.....1
FRE 301.....1
28 U.S.C. sec. 1651 (a).....2
SUPREME COURT RULE 17.1, .2 & .3 3
28 U.S.C. sec. 1251 (b) (3).....4
28 U.S.C. sec. 2201.....4
28 U.S.C. sec, 2283.....4
28 U.S.C. sec. 1602.....4
28 U.S.C. sec. 1605.....4
28 U.S.C. sec. 1603.....5
28 U.S.C. sec. 1446 (d)..... 5
28 U.S.C. sec. 1441(d).....5
28 U.S.C. sec. 1332 (a) (1) (2) (3).....6
28 U.S.C. sec. 1367.....6
28 U.S.C. sec. 1653.....6
FRCP 7(a).....6
28 U.S.C. sec. 1361.....6
28 U.S.C. sec. 2679.....6
28 U.S.C. sec. 1346(b) (1).....6
Wis. Rules of Evidence 901.07.....6
Wis. Rules of Evidence 903.01.....6
28 U.S.C. sec. 1605 (g) (4).....7
28 U.S.C. sec. 2284 (a).....7
FRCP 65(e).....7

28 U.S.C. sec. 2502.....7
28 U.S.C. sec. 530B (a), (b), (c).....8
28 U.S.C. sec. 1359.....8
28 U.S.C. sec. 1698.....8
28 U.S.C. sec. 2241 (c) (4). 8
U.C.C. sec. 1-103.6.....9
28 U.S.C. sec. 1337 (a) 10
Wisconsin Rules of Evidence 902.01 (4),(5)&(6).14
Wisconsin Rules of Evidence 902,02 (7)..... ...14
Wis. Stats. 783.08.....14
U.C.C. sec. 3-509.....15
28 U.S.C. sec. 1652.....16
Wis. Rules of Evidence 906.05.....16
Wis. Rules of Evidence 908.03 (8), (b), (9).....18
Wis. Rules of Evidence 909.015(7).....18
8 U.S.C. sec. 1481 (a) (2).....18
8 U.S.C. sec. 1101 (a) 21 & (23).....18
Wis. Stats. 403.401 (1), (2).....21
Wis. Stats. 403.402 (1).....21
28 U.S.C. sec. 1257 (a) 25
28 U.S.C. sec. 1746 (1) 30

Petitioners as the de jure-nationals of the Wisconsin are in the petition for an extraordinary writ mandamus/ prohibition "In re June 25, 1948, ch.646, 62 Stat. 944" "In re May 24, 1949, ch.139, sec. 90, 63 Stat. 102" "In re SUPREME COURT RULE 20.1,.2 & .3" **by the principle of the law** also "In re June 25, 1948, ch.646, 62 Stat. 928" **"de novo" by the principle of law** issue an extraordinary writ authorized by The congress on the agents including STATE BAR NUMBERS, and assigns in state court and federal court i.e. GRANT COUNTY CIRCUIT COURT its principal place of business in the STATE OF WISCONSIN by the COMMERCIAL ACTIVITIES a fourteenth amendment State a sub set of the D.C. CORPORATION and UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS IN THE WESTERN DIVISION in its principal place of business in D.C. CORPORATION in the breach of and in the violation of Affiants/Claimants political rights and not allowed in state court with third party affidavits, documents, evidence, Brady material, exculpatory evidence, and **denied without grounds** for a Three- judge court, and depositions, for scope of office or employment in federal court that the Affiants do not have any representation whatsoever in the de facto apportionment in the sec. 2 of the fourteenth amendment. We cannot vote in elections it's CRIMINAL "REBELLION" and "TREASON".

See EXHIBIT: A. The certified copy from the clerk of court as the evidence forthwith on the mandatory judicial notice under the Federal Rules of Evidence **"In re Pub. L. 93-595, sec. 1, Jan. 2, 1975, 88 Stat. 1930" by the principle of the law** Rule 201 (d), (e), (f), Rule 202, Rule 203, and "In re Pub. L. 93-595, sec. 1 Jan 2, 1975, 88 Stat. 1931" Rule 301 **by the Writ of the precipe for the filing in the interlocutory appeal by the clerk of the court on the December 10, 2001-A.D. at 11:44-A.M. witness by the postmaster on December 8th , 2001-A.D. "In re June 25, 1948, ch.646, 62 Stat. 928"**

Orders Below

For the order from the GRANT COUNTY CIRCUIT COURT its principal place of business in the STATE OF WISCONSIN by the COMMERCIAL ACTIVITIES a sub set of the D.C. CORPORATION in APPENDIX : A-1 a copy
For the order from the UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS IN THE WESTERN DIVISION in its principal place of business in D.C. CORPORATION in APPENDIX: B-1 for it is unpublished. a copy
For the order from the UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS IN THE WESTERN DIVISION in its principal place of business in D.C. CORPORATION in APPENDIX: C-1 for it is unpublished. a copy
For the judgment and order from the GRANT COUNTY CIRCUIT COURT its principal place of business in the STATE OF WISCONSIN by the COMMERCIAL ACTIVITIES a subset of the D.C. CORPORATION in APPENDIX: D-1 for it is unpublished. a copy
For the order from the SUPREME COURT OF WISCONSIN its principal place of business in the STATE OF WISCONSIN as a fourteenth amendment State a subset of the D.C. CORPORATION in APPENDIX: F-1 for it is unpublished. a copy

Jurisdiction

Petition for an Extraordinary Writ mandamus/ prohibition authorized by the "In re June 25, 1948, ch.646, 62 Stat. 944" "In re May 24, 1949, ch.139, sec. 90, 63 Stat. 102" "In re SUPREME COURT RULE 20.1, .2 & .3" **by the principle of law** ; 28 U.S.C. sec. 1651 (a) " In re the treaty of Paris in the 1783 'Definitive Treaty of Peace' Vol. 8 Statutes at large pg. 80 ratified January 14th, 1784-A.D." **by the principle of law.** "In re The enabling-act of The Wisconsin state by the approval of The twenty-ninth congress, Sess. I Ch. 89. 1846. page-58, section seven (7) of the fifth paragraph (5) **on the**

condition that ... said State shall never interfere with the primary disposal of the soil... **and provided that** no tax shall be imposed on the lands..." **by the principle of law.** "In re Public Law, 15 United States at large, Chapter 249, pgs. 223-224 (1868)" **by the principle of law** . "In re Nov. 18, 1988, Pub. L. 100-694, sec. 5 and sec.6, 102 Stat. 4564 within the scope of his/her office or employment" **by the principle of law**. Congress has vested federal courts with **exclusive jurisdiction** "In re ... between a State and citizens of another State... in the article III sec. 2 clause I Constitution for the United States of America" **by the principle of law** that adequate relief cannot be obtained in any other form or from any other court.

(1)The supreme court shall have original jurisdiction of all actions or proceedings by a ...State against the citizens of another State ... that the supreme court comes into play for actions by-and-against the de jure- nationals of Wisconsin: Larry- Dean: Kallembach and Darrel- Lee: Kallembach as the (Wisconsinite) (i.e. a citizen is an alien to other Union States-ERGO-the Law of Nations) by the de facto States under article III in Constitution United States of America : The eleventh amendment requires courts to take judicial notice of all common law pleas issue estoppel or stay orders. "Common Law, is forever foreign to government law" under the Federal Rules of Evidence Rule 201 (d), (e) & (f) "In re Pub. L. 93-595, sec. 1, Jan. 2,1975, 88 Stat. 1930" judicial notice and the provisions "In re SUPREME COURT RULE 17.1 ,.2 & .3" "In re ...shall be bound by oath or affirmation... in the article VI clause 3 of the Constitution of the United States of America" and acts of congress the CORPORATE By-laws that the judicial officers must abide by oath and affirmation, Rule 202 of the... common law of every other state..., and Rule 203 laws of foreign countries and republics. A foreign state is in the ... republic... under the article IV sec. 4 i.e. Affiants/ Claimants as the de jure-nationals of the Wisconsin as the (Wisconsinite). The

genesis of this statue appears in the original Judiciary Act passed in the late 1700's. The actions or proceedings by the de facto GRANT COUNTY CIRCUIT COURT its principal place of business in STATE OF WISCONSIN as the fourteenth amendment State its a subset of the D.C. CORPORATION is removed under 28: U.S.C. sec. 1251 (b) (3) "In re June 25, 1948, ch. 646, 62 Stat. 927" "In re Sept. 30, 1978, Pub. L. 95-393, sec. 8 (b), 92 Stat. 810" **by the principle of law** using 28: U.S.C. sec. 2201 "In re June 25, 1948, ch. 646, 62 Stat. 964" and sec. 2283 "In re June 25, 1948, ch. 646, 62 Stat. 968" **by the principle of law** in conjunction.

The foregoing statute : 1) it is covering the de facto State jurisdiction for a de jure national. In other words- a citizen who is in his native state (or acquired) is an alien in reference to the jurisdictions of the fourteenth amendment; 2) It is handling matters between States, based on the Law of nations. In other words- when **i.e. flesh and blood man** is in another state he is a citizen from another state, which was the original premise of this statute. Therefore, being de facto, any State would not have jurisdiction on any such **i.e. man** in either arena; thus the supreme court has jurisdiction in either case. Hence, alien is two pronged: It means either/or citizen and/or alien = a de jure national. What "1251" is stating is: When one corrects his nationality, legal actions are handled by the supreme court on constitutional grounds under the law of nations. Then one does not have to play the lawyer appeals game [$] in the U.S. District Courts, which pertain to U.S. citizens. The de jure actions that are handled by the supreme court are Cut a Dry. In other words- were our natural rights violated? Or- did the private laws that are inflicted on Larry-Dean: Kallembach and Darrel-Lee: Kallembach as the de jure nationals apply to us.

(2) Title 28 U.S.C. sec. 1602 and sec.1605 "In re Pub L. 94-583, sec. 4 (a), Oct. 21, 1976, 90 Stat. 2892" are the authority used to create a contract (a contractual agreement) with a

fourteenth amendment State. This is to induce the State "agency or instrumentality of a foreign state" including but not limited to STATE BAR NUMBERS to **forfeit upfront** the sovereign immunity that it will claim. General exceptions to the jurisdictional immunity of a foreign state under international law, states are not immune from the jurisdiction of foreign courts as far as their **commercial activities** are concerned, and their commercial property may be levied upon for the satisfaction of judgments rendered against them in connection with their commercial activities by the 28 U.S.C. sec. 1603 – Foreign states defined, by the 28 U.S.C. sec. 1446 (d) ... the State court shall proceed no further unless and until the case is remanded, and 28 U.S.C. sec. 1441 (d) "In re June 25, 1948, ch. 646, 62 Stat. 937" actions against a foreign state that congress has vested federal courts with **exclusive jurisdiction**. This jurisdictional statue may be used for rights violations.

(3) Complete diversity of citizenship that the petitioners Larry- Dean: Kallembach and Darrel- Lee: Kallembach as the de jure- nationals of Wisconsin (Wisconsinite) vs. STATE OF WISCONSIN as the fourteenth amendment State its principal place of business in D.C. CORPORATION including the agents with the STATE BAR NUMBERS and assigns AMCORE BANK N.A. and/or ANCHORBANK,fsb, for the DEPARTMENT OF TREASURY its principal place of business in D.C. CORPORATION. Amount in controversy **in the deposits** are 229,076 united States Dollars. Definition : one dollar = 100 cents of silver. Original petition : 01C50399 in the UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS WESTERN DIVISION its principal place of business in D.C. CORPORATION also filed by the third party affidavit of witness and notary public of Wisconsin state; foreign agent at the office of REGISTER OF DEEDS, GREEN COUNTY, WISCONSIN its principal place of business in STATE OF WISCONSIN on the November 1, 2001-A.D. by the

document # 421385, vol. 695, page 757 through 779. "In re June 25, 1948, ch.646, 62 Stat. 930" by the principle of law and Strawbridge v. Curtiss, 7 U.S. (3 Cranch) 267 (1806) **by the principle of law** 28 U.S.C. sec. 1332 (a) (1)-(3) and 28 U.S.C. sec. 1367 Supplemental jurisdiction "In re Pub. L. 101-650, title III, sec. 310 (a), Dec. 1, 1990, 104 Stat. 5113" That the court has the jurisdiction to enforce laws WITHOUT the United States.

(4) Therefore, the petitioners as the de jure- nationals of the Wisconsin (Wisconsinite) are reserving our rights in the amending the action under the "In re June 25, 1948,ch. 646, 62 Stat. 944" ; 28: U.S.C. sec. 1653 by the correcting the combination of statues and authorities in accessing the jurisdiction of The court. A "responsive pleading" means a pleading as defined in FRCP 7 (a); a motion to dismiss is not a responsive pleading.

(5) 28 U.S.C. sec. 1361 "In re Pub. L. 87-748, sec. 1(a), Oct. 5 ,1962, 76 Stat. 744" That John Ashcroft d/b/a attorney general for the producing certified copies of scope of respondent's office or employment under the 28 U.S.C. sec. 2679 that **congress has vested** federal courts with **exclusive jurisdiction** 28 U.S.C. sec. 1346 (b) (1) . This Petition To Suppress the motions to dismiss are also based on the grounds of lack of evidence in RESPONDENT'S filings in the response of the case No. 01C50399, or in the alternative produce all evidence pursuant to Wisconsin Rules of Evidence 901.07 and 903.01, produce all supporting evidence, documents and certified copies of scope of said RESPONDENT'S office or employment, certified by the United States Attorney General in 28 U.S.C. sec. 2679 and "In re Nov. 18, 1988, Pub. L. 100-694, sec. 5 and sec. 6, 102 Stat. 4564". **The Affiant's/ Claimants demand discovery for The depositions.** Agents and assigns for STATE OF WISCONSIN in the COMMERCIAL ACTIVITIES are under the " In re Pub. L. 94-583, sec. 4 (a), Oct. 21 1976, 90 Stat. 2892" **by the principle of law** 28 U.S.C. sec1605

(g)(4) Bar on motions to dismiss.

(6) 28: U.S.C. sec. 2284 "In re June 25, 1948, ch.646, 62 Stat. 968", This one deals with the violation of political rights and the Affiants/claimants are not allowed in state court with the third party affidavits, documents, evidence, Brady material, and exculpatory evidence forthwith by the Larry-Dean: Kallembach and Darrel- Lee: Kallembach that Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 65 (e) does not modify any U.S. Statute that relates in the Injunctions and actions required by Act of Congress. We do not have any representation whatsoever in the de facto system. See the de facto apportionment in the fourteenth amendment, sec. 2. We the Affiants cannot vote in any elections it is a CRIME, "REBELLION" and "TREASON". This statute in conjunction with 28 U.S.C. sec. 2502 "In re June 25, 1948, ch.646, 62 Stat. 976" in bringing the state into the action not allowing us in state court with the third party affidavits, documents, evidence, Brady material, and exculpatory evidence in court, while an action is filed challenging the constitutionality of the apportionment of congressional districts or the apportionment of any statewide legislative body also "In re June 25, 1948,ch. 646, 62 Stat. 933" 28 U.S.C 1346 (b) (1) Subject to the provisions of chapter 171 (Tort Claims Procedure) of this title, the district courts ... shall have **exclusive jurisdiction** of civil actions on claims against the United States, for money damages ... for injury or loss of property ...by the negligent or wrongful act or omission of any employee of the Government while acting within the scope of his office or employment, ... would be liable to the claimant in accordance with the law of the place where the act or omission occurred. Common law states are several states in the constitution. When the de jure- nationals are not sued properly & not served properly, by the agents, STATE BAR NUMBERS, or assigns of the ultra vires actions of the State Court service of the wrong people and/or the civil- docket and mails by the agents, STATE BAR

NUMBERS, assigns in federal court "In re Pub. L. 105-277, title VIII, sec 801 (a), Oct. 21, 1998,1112 Stat. 2681-118" 28 U.S.C. sec. 530B (a) ,(b) &(c), **under the use of fictitious names** results in NOW INJURIES by the manufactured diversity is prohibited by the "In re June 25, 1948, ch.646, 62 Stat. 935" 28 U.S.C. sec. 1359. **Torts. An invasion of privacy is whereby persons i.e. attorneys, judges, STATE BAR NUMBERS, government employees, assigns take the name or likeness of another for commercial gain.** Produce the **proxy and cestui que trust forthwith** granting the authority by which a person is so authorized "In re Pub. L. 93-595, sec. 1 Jan. 2, 1975, 88 Stat. 1931" **by the principle of law** FRE Rule 301. The document granting authority for taking property and/or living flesh and blood under the rules of evidence without the "threat" FORCE OF ARMS and JAIL. **Interstate commerce Wisconsin state (Wisconsinites) vs. STATE OF WISCONSIN in COMMERCIAL ACTIVITIES and agents or assigns as U.S. FEDERAL/CITIZENS its principal place of business in D.C. CORPORATION in violation Securities Exchange Act of 1934 BY THE EXCLUSIVE JURISDICTION of federal courts for the slander of credit by the respondent agents and assigns** and Securities Act of 1933 on full disclosure, based on The agents or assigns of UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT as the beneficiaries therefore produce information on the grounds of your firsthand knowledge and evidence forthwith. Remember, our constitutional liberty includes our political rights. "In re SUPREME COURT RULE 20.2"

(7)Writ of habeas corpus cum causa "In re June 25, 1948, ch.646, 62 Stat. 964" by the principle of law "In re May 24, 1949, ch.139, sec. 112, 63 Stat. 105" by the principle of law "In re Sept. 19, 1966, Pub. L. 89-590, 80 Stat. 811" **by the principle of law** by the 28 U.S.C. sec. 1698- common law immunity in filing under FEDERAL civil law a habeas due to the criminal action, 28 U.S.C. sec 2241 (c) (4), FRCP 65 (e),

and 28 U.S.C. sec. 2284 (a) show cause for the restraint of case # 01C50399 in the UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS WESTERN DIVISION its principal place of business in D.C. CORPORATION and Section 1-103.6 (UCC) a law cannot be passed to preclude the common law that Philip G. Reinhard d/b/a chief judge denied the request for "In re June 25, 1948, ch.646, 62 Stat. 968" **by the principle of the law,** Three-judge court without grounds and merits that the Affiants/claimants have no representation what so ever. The court denied in providing the petitioners an opportunity in presenting facts by affidavits, depositions, or in the evidentiary hearing proving the amount in the controversy. Respondent/defendants, and each of you, shall be prepared in providing testimony, and / or verified evidence in support of the grounds and merits for the restraint of life, liberty and property of Larry- Dean: Kallembach and Darrel- Lee: Kallembach and specifically identifying the grounds and merits upon which Darrel- Lee: Kallembach and Larry-Dean: Kallembach are restrained from the third party affidavits, depositions, evidence, and redress of grievances in open court. Larry- Dean: Kallembach and Darrel- Lee: Kallembach as the de jure- nationals of Wisconsin (Wisconsinite) have no representation what so ever in the de facto STATE OF WISCONSIN. Affiants are claiming common law rules and jurisdiction in the "In re Pub. L. 93-595, sec. 1, Jan. 2, 1975, 88 Stat. 1930" that the respondents, agents, and assigns of the COURT are **in breach of the contracts by the acts of congress;** FRE Rule 201 (d) (e) (f) by the judicial notice, Rule 202 by the determination of law of other states including but not limited to common law of every other state, and Rule 203 by the determination of the laws of the foreign countries i.e. "In re article IV sec. 4" Wisconsin republic as the state of the nation under the law of nations between Wisconsin republic de jure nationals (Wisconsinites) **i.e. interstate commerce** STATE OF

WISCONSIN de facto including agents and assigns by the ultra vires acts that the **state cannot interfere with interstate commerce** i.e. STATE OF WISCONSIN in COMMERCIAL ACTIVITIES cannot regulate commerce including but not limited to GRANT COUNTY CIRCUIT COURT, GRANT COUNTY, LAFAYETTE COUNTY, LAFAYETTE COUNTY CIRCUIT COURT and/or WISCONSIN DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE including agents and assigns by the ultra vires acts outside scope of the authority and employment by the breach of the CORPORATE CONTRACT between the agents of STATE OF WISCONSIN by the "In re Constitution of the United States of America article I sec. 8 clause 3" that **Congress has exclusive power of regulating interstate commerce** between the states i.e. STATE OF WISCONSIN in COMMERCIAL ACTIVITIES or foreign nations i.e. state of the nation Wisconsin republic under 28 U.S.C. sec.1337 (a) "In re June 25, 1948,ch. 646, 62 Stat. 931". Philip G. Reinhard d/b/a chief judge STATE BAR NUMBER intent in denying of the petition and presentments forthwith for the Three-judge court without any grounds and merits whatsoever by joining in giving aid and comfort of the enemies under the oath and in open court that the respondent/ defendants, agents, STATE BAR NUMBERS and assigns as the U.S. FEDERAL/CITIZENS and as the registered- voters of the "United States" *(de facto federal government)*, or any "State" *(federal colony)* are in **BREACH** of the private CORPORATE contracts between the UNITED STATES and STATE OF WISCONSIN that the de facto government[s] AS THE AGENTS by the ultra vires actions beyond scope of office or employment cannot **violate** the organic Constitution pursuant to sec. 3 of the fourteenth amendment APPENDIX: E on the grounds by the usurpation of oath and office and writ of prohibition or in the alternative writ of the quo warranto for the agents and assigns in the de facto STATE OF WISCONSIN.

State courts will have nothing to do with us as the de jure nationals; for the purpose of these colony courts are to handle **U.S. nationals under the "Color of War."** That the agents and assigns of the COURTS with the STATE BAR NUMBERS and GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES are in the BREACH and in VIOLATION of the Constitution of the United States , the Acts of congress, and WISCONSIN STATUTES by the CORPORATE By-Laws also The Wisconsin constitution on the May 29th , 1848-A.D. nunc pro tunc by the peoples The state of the nation.

Constitution and Statutory Provisions Involved

That the respondent/defendants as the agents, STATE BAR NUMBERS, and assigns of the STATE OF WISCONSIN are in the **breach** of & in the violation of the "In re acts of congress, Constitution of the United States of America" and Wisconsin constitution on the May 29th, 1848 nunc pro tunc by the peoples. **Definition of In re**: in case citations, esp. in uncontested proceedings.

"In re June 25, 1948, ch.646, 62 Stat. 944" "In re May 24, 1949, ch.139, sec.90, 63 Stat. 102" APPENDIX: E-1

"In re June 25, 1948, ch.646, 62 Stat. 928"APPENDIX: E-1

"sec. 2 of the fourteenth amendment" APPENDIX: E-1

"In re Pub. L. 93-595, sec. 1 Jan. 2, 1975, 88 Stat. 1930" APPENDIX: E-1

"In re Pub. L. 93-595, sec. 1 Jan 2, 1975, 88 Stat. 1931" APPENDIX: E-1

"In re Treaty of Paris in the (1783) 'Definitive Treaty of Peace' Vol. 8 Statutes at large pg. 80 ratified (1784) APPENDIX: E-1

"In re TWENTY NINTH CONGRESS, Ses. I. Ch. 89. 1846. Page 58, section seven (7) of the fifth paragraph (5)" APPENDIX: E-1

"In re Public Law, 15 United States at large, chapter 249, pgs. 223-224 (1868)" APPENDIX: E-1

"In re Nov. 18, 1988, Pub. L. 100-694, sec. 5 and sec. 6,

102 Stat. 4564" APPENDIX: E-2
"In re article III sec. 2 clause I" APPENDIX: E-2
"In re article VI clause 3 Constitution of the United States of America" APPENDIX: E-2
In re article IV sec. 4" APPENDIX: E-2
"In re June 25, 1948, ch.646, 62 Stat. 927" "In re Sept. 30, 1978, Pub. L. 95-393, sec. 8 (b), 92 Stat. 810"APPENDIX:E-2
"In re June 25, 1948, ch.646, 62 Stat. 964" "In re June 25, 1948, ch.646 Stat. 968" APPENDIX: E-2
"In re Pub. L. 94-583, sec. 4 (a), Oct. 21, 1976, 90 Stat. 2892" APPENDIX: E-2
"In re June 25, 1948, ch.646, 62 Stat. 937" "In re Oct.21, 1976, Pub. L. 94-583, sec. 6, 90 Stat. 2898"APPENDIX:E-3
"In re June 25, 1948, ch.626, 62 Stat. 930"APPENDIX:E-3
"In re Pub. L. 101-650, title III, sec. 310 (a), Dec. 1, 1990, 104 Stat. 5113" APPENDIX: E-3
"In re June 25, 1948, ch.646, 62 Stat. 944"APPENDIX:E-3
"In re Pub. L. 87-748, sec. 1 (a), Oct 5, 1962, 76 Stat. 744" APPENDIX: E-3
"In re June 25, 1948, ch.646, 62 Stat. 968" "In re Senate Report 94-204" "In re Aug. 12, 1976, Pub. L. 94-381, sec. 3, 90 Stat. 1119" APPENDIX: E-3
"In re June 25, 1948, ch.646, 62 Stat. 976"APPENDIX:E-3
"In re June 25, 1948, ch.646, 62 Stat. 933"APPENDIX:E-4
In re Pub. L. 105-277, title VIII, sec. 801 (a), Oct 21, 1998, 1112 Stat. 2681-118"APPENDIX:E-4
"In re Securities Exchange Act of 1934"APPENDIX: E-4
"In re Securities Act of 1933" APPENDIX:E-4
"In re June 25, 1948, ch.646, 62 Stat. 964" "In re May 24, 1949, ch.139, sec. 112, 63 stat. 105" "In re Sept. 19, 1966,Pub.L. 89-590, 80 Stat. 811" APPENDIX: E-4
"In re article I sec. 8 clause 3 Constitution of the United States of America" APPENDIX: E-4
"In re June 25, 1948, ch.646 Stat. 931" APPENDIX: E-4
"In re sec.3 of the fourteenth amendment",APPENDIX:E4

"In re article I sec. 10 of the Wisconsin constitution May 29th , 1848-A.D." nunc pro tunc APPENDIX:E-5
"In re article IV sec. 3 clause I of the Constitution of the United States of America" APPENDIX: E -5
"In re article I, sec.4 of the Wisconsin constitution as of May 29th , 1848-A.D." APPENDIX: E-5
"In re article I sec. 9 of the Wisconsin constitution as of May 29th , 1848-A.D." APPENDIX: E-5
"In re article I, sec. 11 of the Wisconsin constitution as of May 29th , 1848-A.D." APPENDIX:E-5
"In re article I, sec. 14 of the Wisconsin constitution as of May 29th , 1848-A.D." APPENDIX: E-5
"In re article I, sec. 21 of the Wisconsin constitution as of May 29th, 1848-A.D." APPENDIX: E-5
"In re article II, sec.1 & sec. 2 of the Wisconsin constitution as of the May 29th , 1848-A.D." nunc pro tunc APPENDIX:E-5
"In re June, 25, 1948, ch.646 Stat. 944" APPENDIX: E-6
"In re Pub. L. 94-550, sec. 1 (a), Oct. 18, 1976, 90 Stat. 2534" APPENDIX: E-6

Statement of the Issues

A. That the Affiant's/Claimant's invoke the original jurisdiction of the supreme court in the article III ...between a State and citizens of another State... that the Petition to Vacate and Void Judgment is brought as a matter of a Constitutional breach and filed for the purpose of: (1) the scope of authority of Robert P. Van De Hey d/b/a JUDGE/ATTORNEY/ STATE BAR NUMBER; (2) cancellation of judgment order/case number 00-CV-355, December 11th , 2000; (3) the legality of the alleged judgment order/case number 00-CV-355, December 11th, 2000 (4) the validity of the alleged judgment order/case number 00-CV-355; (5) whether the alleged judgment order signed by Robert P. Van De Hey d/b/a JUDGE/ATTORNEY STATE BAR NUMBER have damaged the

Affiant's/Claimant's and have denied said Affiant's/ Claimant's access to the court; (6) whether Robert P. Van De Hey d/b/a JUDGE/ATTORNEY STATE BAR NUMBER Breached his authority when signing said judgment; (7) whether the alleged judgment order/case number 00-CV-355 is to be cancelled of record; (8) whether a Writ of Execution is to issue against the PERSON so stated. SEE APPENDIX: D-1 & 2.

Affiant's/Claimant's also Petition this court to vacate and void judgment 00-CV-355 on the grounds that the PLAINTIFF'S failed to produce any evidence and properly follow the Evidence Codes forthwith based upon the Rules of evidence, Wisconsin Rules of Evidence 902.01 (4), (5) & (6) and 902.02 (7).

B.) What are the grounds and where is the authority for your ruling by Robert P. Van De Hey d/b/a judge/attorney as the U.S. CITIZEN/FEDERAL and RESIDNET OFWISCONSIN in your judicial determination forthwith? Or in the alternative then you admit that and stipulate that under the writ of the prohibition, Wis. Stats. 783.08 by the principle of law for the usurpation of the power by the unlawful seizure and assumption of another's position, office not duly qualified/perjured of the oath of the office no-power while in the office, and authority are by the indictable acts under R.I.C.O. unlawful assessment and debt collection therefore, the fraudulent judgment order puts the full burden of the proof on Robert P. Van De Hey as the insurgent/rebel by your signature on the in frauduam legis DECLARATORY JUDGEMENT AND FINAL ORDER using dolus by the SIMULATION OF PROCESS 00-CV-355 on the December 11th , 2000-A.D. and ORDER 01-CV-491 AND 01-CV-411 on the November 27th , 2001-A.D. denying the depositions, Brady material, affidavits, firsthand knowledge, exculpatory evidence by the predicate acts and indictable acts of the honorable. Locks every case for Robert P. Van De Hey, insurgent/ judge / STATE BAR NUMBER/Attorney /rebel

conflict of interest PERSON/DEBTOR while the prosecution is going on because the judge is in the recess his oath of

office is in the challenge and cannot act on any thing because you Robert P. Van De Hey forfeit your bar number on the grounds forthwith on the fraud, perjury, theft & slander of my credit by your stipulation and agreement in the evidence and by your silence under oath and in open-court admitting under the perjury of the oath of office for the forfeiture of the oath of office and bar number forthwith in article I of the sec. 10 in the Wisconsin constitution on May 29th , 1848 nunc pro tunc "In re June 25, 1948, ch.646, 62 Stat. 944" by the principle of law. At the office of the register of deeds GREEN COUNTY, WISCONSIN its principal place of business in STATE OF WISCONSIN on the November 1,

2001-A.D. by the document # 421384, vol. 695 page 720 through 756 by the **formal certificate of the protest** by Notary Public of Wisconsin state as the foreign agent under U.C.C. sec. 3-509.

C.)Affiant's/Claimant's Larry- Dean: Kallembach and Darrel- Lee: Kallembach hereby demand Suppression of PLAINTIFF'S Motion for FORECLOSURE dated October 11th, 2001-A.D. and PLAINTIFF'S Motion for FORECLOSURE dated August 31st, 2001-A.D. Robert S. Duxstad d/b/a ATTORNEY; AMCORE BANK its principal place of business in STATE OF WISCONSIN a subset of D.C. CORPORATION, Ron Georgeson d/b/a PRESIDENT and David Kneple d/b/a PRESIDENT ; ANCHOR BANK,fsb, Jeffery L. Landsman d/b/a ATTORNEY; ANCHORBANK, fsb, Doug Timmerman d/b/a PRESIDENT and /or undisclosed agents, in FORCLORSURE case number: 01-CV-491 and case number: 01-CV-411 on the grounds that Robert P. Van De Hey **Breached** his Oath of Office in article VI clause 3 of the Constitution the United States of America when signing order/case number: 00-CV-

355 dated December 11th , 2000-A.D. and has **Breached** his contract with the CORPORATE By-Laws of the United States of America to Wit: (1) Article IV sec. 3 clause I "..no new state shall be formed or erected with the Jurisdiction of any other State; nor any State be formed by the Junction of two or more States, or Parts of States..." and has **Breached** The Wisconsin constitution on the May 29th ,1848-A.D. nunc pro tunc to wit: (1) right to assemble and petition, article 1, sec. 4 "...and to petition the government, for any department thereof..." , (2) Remedy for wrongs in article I, sec. 9 "...completely and without denial, promptly and without delay...", (3) Searches and seizures article I, sec.11 "...supported by oath and affirmation..." (4) Feudal tenures in article I, sec. 14 "...and feudal tenures are prohibited..." and (5) article II boundaries sec. 1 and sec. 2 "An act to enable the people of Wisconsin territory to form a constitution and state government and for the admission of such state into the union," approved August sixth , one thousand eight hundred and forty-six, to wit : ... . Allodially – that is, free of feudal services and incidents. An act of congress entitled " ...and grant pre-emption rights." Approved September fourth, one thousand eight hundred and forty-one. "In re June 25, 1948, ch.646, 62 Stat. 944" **by the principle** of law , 28 U.S.C. sec. 1652. Robert P. Van De Hey d/b/a JUDGE/ATTORNEY STATE BAR NUMBER may not testify give evidence under oath in denying access in the court under the Wisconsin Rules of Evidence 906.05 and "In re Pub. L. 93-595, sec. 1, Jan. 2, 1975, 88 Stat. 1934" for the 01-CV-491 and 01-CV-411.

This Petition To Suppress is also based on the grounds of lack of evidence in PLAINTIFF'S filing, or in the alternative produce all evidence pursuant to Wisconsin Rules of Evidence 901.07 and 903.01, produce all supporting evidence, documents and certified copies of scope of said above PLAINTIFF'S office of employment, certified by the United States Attorney General "In re Nov. 18,1988, Pub. L.

100-694, sec. 5, sec. 6, 102 Stat. 4564" 28 U.S.C. sec. 2679. The Affiants/ Claimants demand discovery for the depositions 01-CV-491 and 01-CV-411.

D.) Affiant's/Claimant's Demand PLAINTIFF'S the agent's WISCONSIN DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE its principal place of business in D.C. CORPORATION, Cate S. Zeuske; the agent's of AMCORE BANK N.A. its principal place of business in D.C. CORPORATION, Robert S. Duxstad; the agent's of ANCHORBANK its principal place of business in D.C. CORPORATION, fsb, Jeffery L. Landsman so named above produce the certified evidence i.e. proxy and cestui que trust without the FORCE OF THE ARMS and JAIL by the Sheriffs Sale that the UPPER CASE LETTERS name's "LARRY DEAN KALLEMBACH and DARRELL KALLEMBACH" exist, or any variation thereof.

The PLAINTIFF'S as mentioned above error in choosing or identifying Larry- Dean: Kallembach and Darrel- Lee: Kallembach and the PERSON'S named in said above cases is not Larry- Dean: Kallembach and Darrel- Lee: Kallembach, the error is misidentification i.e. the wrong PERSON'S were sued. The PLAINTIFF'S sued the wrong PERSON'S and the statue of limitations is not tolled. PLAINTIFF'S "Misidentified" Larry- Dean: Kallembach and Darrel- Lee: Kallembach, pursuant to 903.01 Wisconsin Evidence Code. See Exhibit "B and C".

Judicial Notice: Oath's of Office

The Affiant's/Claimant's invoke the judicial power of the justices in the Petition with duties to adjudicate this Petition pursuant to the provisions of article VI clause 3 of the Constitution of the United States of America, through the Federal Rules of Evidence Rule "In re Pub. L. 93-595, sec. 1, Jan. 2, 1975, 88 Stat. 1930" 201 (d), (e), & (f) and by the justice's Oath of office. The Affiant's invoke a de jure /original judicial court and the FRANCHISE-COURT at law must fold and yield to the judicial court in law, by the principle of law, the Oath of Office converts the court into a

judicial court. Affiant's/Claimant's do not accept any sub silentio of the STATE BAR NUMBERS and silent notice to deter from the pure judicial court.

Ultimate facts

1.) Definition of pro se: I speak as myself.
2.) Affiant as the Larry- Dean: Kallembach or Darrel- Lee: Kallembach has received no rebuttals from the respondent agents d/b/a unincorporated associations, or any one else, with regard in the affidavit by the Declaration of Allegiance in an American Republic, by The Protest/Claim in regard to Birth Certificate; cancellation for legal cause, Protest, Claim and Demand in Regard to Bona Fide Contracts, and Claim, Protest and demand in Regard to Currency of the United states by a third party witness amended for Larry- Dean: Kallembach on the August 7th , 2001-A.D and Notary Public of Wisconsin state; foreign agent at the office of the register of deeds, GREEN COUNTY its principal place of business in STATE OF WISCONSIN on the October 22nd, 2001-A.D. or January 11th, 2002-A.D. under the Wis. Stats. 908.03 (8) (b), (9) and under the Wis. Stats. 909.015 (7) by the document # 420942, vol.693, page 660 through 665 or by the document # 424404, vol.711, page 008 through 012. Declarant executes the above declaration as a matter of the natural- right as pursuant to general premises of the law of nations and by ancillary law established by Congress of the United States, as vested to said Congress by the Constitution of the United States, article I, sec. 8 paragraph 4, which includes, but is not limited to, "In re Public law, 15 United States at Large, chapter 249, pps. 223-224 (1868)", Title 8 of the United States Code, sections 1481 (a) (2) and 1101 (a) (21) & (23); and regard to all such law by the admitting that and stipulating that an action is filed before the court challenging the constitutionality of the apportionment of congressional districts. Therefore I do not have any representation whatsoever in the de facto system. See the de

facto apportionment in the fourteenth amendment sec. 2. I the Affiant cannot vote in any elections it is a CRIME "REBELLION" and "TREASON". EXHIBIT: B, C

3.) Definition of pro se: I speak as myself.

4.) Affiant as the Darrel- Lee: Kallembach or Larry- Dean: Kallembach has received no rebuttal from the respondents as the unincorporated associations by the revoking of the voter-registration forthwith ab initio for the legal cause in the NOTICE at the office of GREEN COUNTY- clerk and at the office of the STATE DEPARTMENT OF ELECTIONS by the keeping the voter- registration in their private possession, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE and WISCONSIN ATTORNEY GENERAL by the admitting that and stipulating that the answer is "YES" attached fully incorporated by the notice of the Notary Public of Wisconsin foreign agent at the office of the register of deeds, GREEN COUNTY its principal place of business in STATE OF WISCONSIN on the June 05th , 2000-A.D. or April 11th , 2000-A.D. under the Wis. Stats. 908.03 (8) (b) and under the Wis. Stats. 909.015 by the document # 406429, vol. 641 page 665 through 667 or by the document # 404851, vol. 637, page 702 through 704 by The public-policy after 30 days. See the de facto apportionment in the fourteenth-amendment sec. 2 when an action is filed challenging by the constitutionality of the apportionment of congressional districts. Wherefore my constitutional rights are in the violation. REMEMBER, MY CONSTITUTIONAL LIBERTY INCLUDES MY POLITICAL RIGHTS. Therefore, I do not have any representation whatsoever in the de facto system. Exhibit: D, E

5.) Affiants/Claimants Larry- Dean: Kallembach and Darrel-Lee: Kallembach are and continues to be adversely affected by said judgment and continues to be injured by on going Fraudulent claims made by the above mentioned PLAINTIFF'S in fraudem legis 00-CV-355.

6.) The use of fictitious names in a federal lawsuit is against

public policy. Doe v. Blue Shield United, 112 F.3d 869 (7th Cir. 1997) **by the principle of law**.
7.) Robert Van De Hey d/b/a JUDGE/ATTORNEY AGENT'S STATE BAR NUMBERS and ASSIGNS in GRANT COUNTY, CIRCUIT COURT, STATE OF WISCONSIN its principal place of business in D.C. CORPORATION are in a **Breach** the Constitution of the United states of America in the article IV sec 3 clause I "... no new State shall be formed or erected with the Jurisdiction of any other State, nor any State be formed by the Junction of two or more States, or Parts of States." by disregarding their contract with the United States, and have denied Larry-Dean: Kallembach and Darrel- Lee: Kallembach access in the court. Said judgment is under the authority of Diane Perkins d/b/a clerk of CIRCUIT COURT, GRANT COUNTY, CIRCUIT COURT its principal place of business in STATE OF WISCONSIN in COMMERCIAL ACTIVITIES Who continues to deny all attempts by Larry- Dean: Kallembach and Darrel- Lee: Kallembach to file affidavits/documents/ evidence/ Brady material and evidentiary evidence in support of the Affiant's claim and are now and continue to be in **Breach** of the article IV sec. 3 clause I of the Constitution for the United States of America contract with the CORPORATE by- laws of the United States and the above respondents for the de facto government are in **breach** of sec 3 of the fourteenth amendment of the constitution for the United States of America with the CORPORATE By- Laws . See Exhibits "F and I".
8.) The plaintiff's make an error in choosing or identifying the [Defendant's], and the [PERSON'S] named are not the correct [Defendant's], the error is misidentification, i.e. the wrong [PERSON'S] were sued. The Plaintiff's sued the wrong [Defendant's], and the lawsuit does not toll the statue of limitations in 00-CV-355, 01-CV-411, and 01-CV-491.
9.) The insurgent register of deeds/rebel agent Marilyn Pierce for the GRANT COUNTY CIRCUIT COURT its

principal place of business in STATE OF WISCONSIN in COMMERCIAL ACTIVITIES intent and scheme on making a **judicial determination** on particular documents are required or allowed to be registered it shall be resolved in favor of registration. Documents by the agents ultra vires actions of the court in GRANT COUNTY CIRCUIT COURT its principal place of business in STATE OF WISCONSIN in COMMERCIAL ACTIVITIES are filed for the register of deeds in the making a judicial determination **by the exclusion** of the documents and refusing presentments that are under oath and seal by the notary public, third party witnesses for Larry- Dean: Kallembach. APPENDIX: D-1 & 2

10.) A lis pendens was filed in register of deeds by the GRANT COUNTY its principal place of business in STATE OF WISCONSIN a subset in D.C. CORPORATION and agents and register of deeds by the LAFAYETTE COUNTY its principal place of business in STATE OF WISCONSIN a subset in D.C. CORPORATION and agents and assigns by the ultra vires actions under color of law **by the breach and in the violation acts of congress** i.e. CORPORATE by-laws by the private contracts between the UNITED STATES and STATE OF WISCONSIN and the agents that Robert P. Van De Hey d/b/a judge/attorney STATE BAR NUMBER and assigns or agents of the STATE BAR NUMBER co-conspirators with the intent and scheme not allowing affidavits, documents, depositions, and evidence in protecting the land from theft by the conversion from the Sheriff's Sale by the FORCE OF ARMS and JAIL **using threat, duress, and coercion extorting the land for The PRIVATE monetary and political gain that The alleged contracts are void ab initio for legal cause.**

11.) That pursuant to the Wisconsin Statutes, Subchapter IV, 403.401 (1), (2) and 403.402 (1) the signature of Robert P. Van De Hey as agent of the STATE OF WISCONSIN its principal place of business in D.C. CORPORATION is the

signature of Robert P. Van De Hey.
12.) That the minimum standard for in personam jurisdiction of Robert P. Van De Hey is met in that alleged judgment order case number 00-CV-355 is filed in the STATE CIRCUIT COURT , GRANT COUNTY a subset of D.C. CORPORATION under the authority of the JUDGE/ ATTORNEY STATE BAR NUMBER Robert P. Van De Hey.
13.) That Robert P. Van De Hey's citizenship is an U.S. FEDERAL CITIZEN as a registered voter and oath of office as per your witness Kevin J. Kennedy d/b/a Executive Director State Elections Board STATE OF WISCONSIN ELECTIONS BOARD a subset of the D.C. CORPORATION. Exhibit: F
14.) That James Doyle's citizenship is an U.S. FEDERAL CITIZEN as a registered voter and oath of office as per your witness Kevin J. Kennedy d/b/a executive Director State Elections Board STATE OF WISCONSIN ELECTIONS BOARD a sub set of the D.C. CORPORATION. Exhibit: G
15.) That William D. Johnston's citizenship is an U.S. FEDERAL CITIZEN as a registered voter and oath of office as per your witness Kevin J. Kennedy d/b/a Executive Director State Elections Board STATE OF WISCONSIN ELECTIONS BOARD a subset of the D.C. CORPORATION. Exhibit: H
16.) That James R. Beer's citizenship is an U.S. FEDERAL CIIZEN as a registered voter and oath of office as per your witness Kevin J. Kennedy d/b/a Executive Director State Elections Board STATE OF WISCONSIN ELECTIONS BOARD a subset of the D.C. CORPORATION. Exhibit: J
17.) Robert P. Van De Hey d/b/a JUDGE/ATTORNEY STATE BAR NUMBER as the U.S. CITIZEN FEDERAL CITIZEN quashed subpoenas by Larry- Dean: Kallembach and Darrel- Lee: Kallembach for the depositions , certified scope of office and employment "In re Pub. L. 100-694 sec, 5, 6, 102 Stat. 4564. Nov. 18, 1988" , and information of the

first hand knowledge, Brady material and exculpatory evidence ect. For case # 01-CV-491 and 01-CV-411 on November 27, 2001-A.D. . APPENDIX: A-1

18.) What are the grounds and where is the authority for your ruling by Robert Van De Hey d/b/a judge/attorney/STATE BAR NUMBER for 00-CV-355, 01-CV-411, and 01-CV-491 in your judicial- determination forthwith?

19.) P. Michael Mahoney d/b/a JUDGE/ATTORNEY STATE BAR NUMBER as the U.S. CITIZEN FEDERAL CITIZEN quashed subpoenas and depositions, certified scope of office or employment "In re Pub. L. 100-694 sec. 5, 6, 102 Stat. 4564 Nov. 18, 1988" for first hand knowledge and information on the November 28, 2001-A.D. also stricken the hearing on December 7th , 2001-A.D. for the case # 01C50399. APPENDIX: B-1, C-2

20.) Affiant has received non-rebuttal from the justices of the Wisconsin supreme court with regard The Wisconsin constitution on the May 29th, 1848-A.D. **controls** the WISCONSIN STATUTES including but not limited to Wis. Stats. 1.01.

21.)Affiant has received no response based upon grounds and merits of a judicial determination. from the justices with regard in article I of the sec. 21 of The Wisconsin constitution of May 29th,1848-A.D. by the peoples nunc pro tunc correcting in fraudum legis 00-CV-355 judgment by Robert . Van De Hey d/b/a judge in a de noval / writ of prohibition that allows Marilyn Pearce d/b/a register of deeds and Cate S. Zuske d/b/a secretary of revenue and/or Rick G. Chandler d/b/a secretary of revenue deny the filings notarized documents in deeds and acting as judge without producing the evidence forthwith by Wisconsin Rules of Evidence 901.07 also James R. Beer d/b/a judge GREEN COUNTY its principle place of business in STATE OF WISCONSIN on the grounds for the denying access in the court for redress of grievance on a land contract by Pauline F. Chandler, U.S. FEDERAL/CITIZEN. The oath of office for the justices of

the SUPREME COURT OF WISCONSIN are recorded in GREEN COUNTY its principal place of business in STATE OF WISCONSIN by the document # 420408 vol. 691, page 321...358...360...387... in deeds being true correct and complete under article II boundaries of The Wisconsin constitution on the May 29th, 1848-A.D. nunc pro tunc.

22.) Affiants have received no response from Scott McCallum d/b/a GOVERNOR OF WISCONSIN his beliefs contrary that in The Wisconsin constitution by The article XIV sec. 13 all common law cases are to tried by the affidavit recorded in deeds by being public-policy controls WISCONSIN STATUTES. See the ACTUAL NOTICE TO THE CHIEF EXECTIVE OFFICER OF THIS STATE and the Oath of Office of Governor by a third party witness and notary public of Wisconsin state; foreign agent at the office of register of deeds, GREEN COUNTY its principal place of business in STATE OF WISCONSIN on the November 19th, 2001-A.D. by the document # 422006 vol. 699, page 006 through 010 and document # 422007 vol. 699, page 011 through 015. see exhibit: K,L

23.) Affiant as the Larry- Dean: Kallembach has received no rebuttal from agents and assigns Marilyn Pierce d/b/a register of deeds and Cate S. Zeuske d/b/a secretary of revenue of STATE OF WISCONSIN its principal place of business in D.C. CORPORATION as the "In re Pub. L. 94-583,sec. 4(a), Oct. 21, 1976, 90 Stat. 2892" "agency or instrumentality of a foreign state" with regard the Formal Certificate of Protest, page 756 below served upon Marilyn Pierce and Cate S. Zeuske on the Oct. 27th, 2001-A.D.. The document # 421384 recorded on Nov. 1st, 2001-A.D. and Pauline F. Chandler the U.S. FEDERAL/CITIZEN with regard the Formal Certificate of Protest page 115 below served upon Pauline F. Chandler on the Oct. 3rd,2001-A.D. recorded on Oct. 4th,2001-A.D.

24.) SUPREME COURT OF WISCONSIN a subset of D.C. CORPORATION "In re Pub. L. 94-583, sec. 4 (a), Oct. 21,

1976, 90 Stat. 2892" "agency or instrumentality of a foreign state" ordered that the petition 01-2754-W and 01-2755-W are denied without the any grounds and merits making a judicial determination on January 29, 2002. see APPENDIX: F The justices of the supreme court of Wisconsin have breached their contract with the CORPORATE Bi-Laws of the Untied States of America to wit: (1) Amendment I, "petition the Government for redress of grievances" (2) Amendment V, "nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law"and "Inre Wisconsin constitution as of May 29th, 1848-A.D. to wit: (1) Right to assemble and petition Article I, Section 4, 'and to petition the government, for any department thereof, shall never be abridged' Section 5 'trail by the jury', Remedy for wrongs Section 9, 'completely and without denial, promptly and without delay' and Section 11 "supported by oath and affirmation, Section 21 'Writs of error shall never be prohibited by law" "In re case # 01-2754-W and 01-2755-W" under the 28 U.S.C. sec. 1257 (a) "In re June 25, 1948, ch.646, 62 Stat. 929"

Reason for granting of the writ mandamus/prohibition

1.)Congress provides that the federal courts have exclusive jurisdiction i.e. ... between a State and Citizens of another State... in article III, sec. 2, clause 1 of the Constitution specifies the outer limits of federal subject-matter jurisdiction. See Finley v. U.S., 490 545, 548-49, 109 S. Ct. 2003, 2006 (1989) by the principle of the law. Within these limits, federal courts can hear only those cases that are authorized by Congress. See Coury v. Prot, 85 F 3d 244, 248 (5th Cir. 1996) by the principle of the law; admiralty and maritime cases 28 U.S.C. sec. 1333; Federal Tort Claims Act 28 U.S.C. sec. 1346 (b); Actions against a foreign state 28 U.S.C. sec. 1441 (d); Securities Exchange Act of 1934 i.e. interstate commerce. Issue a writ of the mandamus/ prohibition by the presentment forthwith remanding the "In re case number: 01C50399 as of October 29th, 2001-A.D." with the procedure for acquiring a Three-judge court as set

forthwith in "Senate Report 94-204" "In re Aug. 12, 1976, Pub. L. 94-381, 3, 90 Stat. 1119" a Three-judge court is to be invoked when otherwise required by an act of congress otherwise in a different manner that is "Senate Report 94-204, page 1992 injunctive relief" and/or in cases challenging the constitutionality of any statute apportioning congressional districts "general governmental powers over the entire area served by the body" i.e. STATE OF WISCONSIN\ ELECTIONS BOARD. Where such a body exercises its powers over the entire State, this section requires that three-judges hear cases challenging apportionment of its membership, Exhibit F,G,H, J.

2.)Writ of mandamus is appropriate to compel corrective action when a judicial tribunal below has exceeded its state court with third party affidavits, documents, evidence, Brady material, and exculpatory evidence forthwith and federal court denied the Affiants/claimants (with no representation whatsoever) a Three-judge court for an opportunity in presenting by the affidavits, formal certificate of the protest by the Notary Public of Wisconsin, depositions, or in the evidentiary hearing proving the amount in the controversy. A writ of mandamus is sought from "In re June 25, 1948, ch. 646, 62 Stat. 928" an appellant court "In re... between a State and citizens of another State... in the article III sec. 2 of the Constitution" to confine a trial court to a lawful exercise of its prescribed authority, the court shall issue the writ as a matter of course. The United States supreme court states:

"The traditional use of the writ in aid of appellate jurisdiction both at common law and in the federal courts has been to confine an inferior court to a lawful exercise of its prescribed jurisdiction." "In re case #01-2754-W"

3.) A writ of mandamus issues to compel an inferior court's agents, STATE BAR NUMBERS, and assigns to expunge from the records orders, and judgments void 00-CV-355 because entered with intent and denial of redress of the grievances in open court also the agents, STATE BAR

NUMBERS, & assigns are in the breach and in the violation of the acts of congress and constitution between the STATE OF WISCONSIN i.e. fourteenth amendment State and the UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT. Again, it issues in compelling the judge to vacate an improper order/judgment that no more affidavits and documents be filed in a pending action and no depositions restraining affiants/claimants liberty protected by the writ of prohibition from unlawful restraints. Issue writ of mandamus dismissing pending actions 01-CV-491& 01-CV-411 forthwith.

4.) The writ of mandamus issues against lower courts to compel them to honor their legal duties, even of a judicial nature. The Maine Court states: mandamus lies to all inferior tribunals, magistrates and officers and extends to all cases of neglect to perform a legal duty where there is no other adequate remedy. It applies to judicial as well as ministerial acts.

5.) Mandamus lies to compel a court to respect the prevailing rules of judicial procedure. Thus, the writ issues to compel a lower court to allow discovery. The Wisconsin court observed: Where it clearly appears that discretion has been not merely abused, but not exercised at all, or that the action taken by inferior courts is without substance of legal cause, and no other adequate remedy exists, mandamus will lie to compel the specification which should have been taken.

Injunctive Relief and Relief sought

1)Wherefore, Affiant's/Claimant's hereby seek Injunctive relief and request this court to void/cancel said judgment in case number 00-CV-355 and to sanction, Diane Perkins and Robert P. Van De Hey from further damaging Larry- Dean: Kallembach and Darrel- Lee: Kallembach. Furthermore, to Suppress case number 01-CV-411 and 01-CV-491 pursuant to WISCONSIN STATUTES the CORPORATE BY-LAWS 809.52 until Robert P. Van De Hey and Diane Perkins can once again abide by their oaths of office and their contracts are in the breach and in the violation with the Wisconsin

constitution on the May 29th , 1848 nun pro tunc , acts of congress , and redress of Grievance's are reestablished for the Affiants/Claimants in other words being able to file document's, Petition's, Writ's, Affidavit's, depositions, and Evidence ect.

2) The respondents are acting as agents in fact although not a legal entity of the above joint enterprises under the color of law have complete liability JOINT and SEVERAL for each violation is separate violation for the damages including **injunctive- relief**, extra ordinary relief, actual, court cost, punitive and **treble damages**, by the agents, STATE BAR NUMBERS and assigns by the ultra vires actions in the theft by the conversion by the threat and intimidation of the Sheriff's sale, Sheriff's deed by the FORCE OF THE ARMS & JAIL the agent's and assigns of the STATE OF WISCONSIN in the COMMERCIAL ACTIVITIES **breached and in the violation of** the CORPORATE CONTRACT i.e. Acts of Congress, The Constitution of the United States of America also The Wisconsin constitution on the May 29th, 1848 nunc pro tunc by the peoples therefore the following amount in the dollars **(i.e. definition of one dollar = 100 cents of silver)** are stolen by the agents and assigns : James Warsaw, Ron Georgeson, Barbara Hinshaw, David A. Kenple, Robert S. Duxstad for AMCORE BANK N.A. 64,575.00; Doug Timmerman, Jeffery L. Landsman for ANCHORBANK ,fsb, 105,000; James E. Doyle for WISCONSIN DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE its principal place of business in the STATE OF WISCONSIN 4,500; Jo-Ann Millhouse, Louise Ketterer, Diane Perkins for GRANT COUNTY 1,675.62 and 35,313.71 and 7352.50; Spencer Benedict for LAFAYETTE COUNTY 11,965.44; Todd W. Schluche for KITTELSEN, BARRY, ROSS, WELLINGTON AND THOMPSON 5,097.00; Brian C. Mcgraw for BRIAN MCGRAW 1,198.92; H. Candace Gorman for H.CANDACE GORMAN 500.00; and Cate S. Zeuske for CATE S. ZEUSKE 1,729.00; FOR A TOTAL OF

THE 238,907.19 dollars under R.I.C.O. tort-damages that the agents with STATE BAR NUMBERS and assigns of STATE OF WISCONSIN i.e. COMMERCIAL ACTIVITIES in the violation of Affiants/Claimants political rights and not allowed in state court with the third party affidavits, documents, depositions, evidence, Brady material, exculpatory evidence, and denied without grounds for a Three- judge court, and depositions, scope of office and employment in federal court that the Affiants do not have any representation whatsoever in the de facto apportionment in the fourteenth amendment sec. 2. We cannot vote in any elections it's CRIMINAL "REBELLION" and "TREASON" ABSOLUTE !!!!!!!!!! Therefore, the affiants are suing the agents and assigns of the STATE OF WISCONSIN and agents and assigns - of the UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT including the agents and assigns of the DEPARTMENT OF TREASURY private corporations in the COMMERCE under the "In re June 25, 1948, ch. 646, 62 Stat. 968" **by the principle of law** 28 U.S.C. sec 2284 in conjunction with "In re June 25, 1948, ch.646, 62 Stat. 976" **by the principle of law** 28 U.S.C. sec. 2502 to bring the State in the action , and "In re June 25, 1948, ch.646, 62 Stat. 933" **by the principle of law** 28 U.S.C. sec. 1346 (b) (1) district courts... shall have exclusive jurisdiction of actions bringing in the federal government into the action ... by the negligent or wrongful act or omission of any employee of the Government while acting within the scope of his/her office or employment... for said political rights violations. Remember, the Affiants/Claimants constitutional liberty includes our political rights for the NOW DAMAGES and NOW INJURIES by the joint tortfeasors for the writ of the execution by the supreme court. A foreign state shall not be immune from the jurisdiction of courts of the United States or of the States in any case : (1) In which the foreign state has waived its immunity either explicitly or by implication... (2) In which the action is based upon **a commercial activity**

carried on in the United States by a foreign state; or upon an act performed in the United States (of America)... (3) In which rights in (land) taken in violation of international law... under the 28 U.S.C. sec 1605 (a) (1) (2) (3) See 28 U.S.C. sec. 1602 for congressional declaration of State liability. **"In re Pub. L. 94-583, sec. 4 (a), Oct. 21, 1976, 90 Stat. 2892"** by the principle of law 28 U.S.C. sec. 1603 for definitions pertaining to this section.

For the above respondents as the agents, assigns, and STATE BAR NUMBERS d/b/a unincorporated associations are indictable acts by the presentments forthwith.

Petitioners can amend the petition at any time. "In re June 25, 1948, ch.646, 62 Stat. 944"

The petition for the "In re June 25, 1948, ch.646, 62 Stat. 944" "In re May 24, 1949, ch.139, sec. 90, 63 Stat. 102" extraordinary writ shall be granted by the presentments forthwith with out delay that adequate relief cannot be obtained in any other form or from any other court.

ASSEVATION UNDER PENALTY OF LAW PURSUANT TO PREMISE OF Title 28 U.S.C. sec. 1746 (1) "In re Pub. L. 94-550, sec. 1 (a), Oct. 18, 1976, 90 Stat. 2534"

With the reservation of all rights and waiver of none.

Further Claimant saith naught.

Darrel-Lee Kallembach

Darrel- Lee: Kallembach as the de jure- national
in the right of the Wisconsin (Wisconsinite)
as the claimant

Larry-Dean Kallembach

Larry- Dean: Kallembach as the de- jure national
in the right of the Wisconsin (Wisconsinite)
as the claimant

STATE OF WISCONSIN CIRCUIT COURT GRANT COUNTY

AMCORE BANK, N.A., ORDER
Plaintiff,

Vs. Case No.: 01-CV-491
Darrel Kallembach, et al case code: 30404
Respondent,

ANHORBANK, fsb,
Plaintiff,

Vs. Case No.: 01-CV-411
Foreclosure of Mortgage: 30404
Amount Greater Than $5,000.00

Darrel Kallembach, et al
Respondent.

This matter having come before the court and the court being fully advised in the premises;
IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:

1. That the subpoenas issued by Larry Kallembach in the above two actions is hereby quashed. That Jo-Ann Millhouse need not appear for depositions scheduled by Larry Kallembach and can ignore any further subpoenas issued by Larry Kallembach in this matter.

Dated this 27th day of November , 2001.

BY THE COURT
s/_____
Robert P. Van De Hey, Circuit Court Judge

APPENDIX: A-1

United States District Court, Northern District of Illinois
Western Division
Answer brief to motion due 1/9/02. Reply to answer brief due 1/23/02.
Status hearing re-set for 5/3/02 at 1:30.
Other docket entry If a party is not going to file a brief in response or reply, it is that party's obligation, within the time frame established by this order, to so notify the court in writing. Defendant's motions to quash subpoenas are granted without prejudice. The court orders that no discovery occur until a case management order is in place or until further order of court. Defendants' applications for Jeffrey L. Landsman and Mary Beth Peraanteau to appear pro hac vice are granted.

Sitting Judge P. Michael Mahoney
Assigned judge Wayne Anderson
11/28/2001

APPENDIX: B-1

United States District Court, Northern District of Illinois
Western Division

Other docket entry Pursuant to the minute order entered November 28, 2001, the status hearing set for December 7, 2001 is stricken. No parties are to appear. Status hearing reset for May 3, 2002 at 1:30 pm.

Philip G. Reinhard, chief judge or P. Michael Mahoney
11/29/2001

APPENDIX: C-1

STATE OF WISCONSIN CIRCUIT COURT GRANT COUNTY

Cate S. Zeuske, Secretary
Wisconsin Department of Revenue
125 Webster Street, 2nd Floor
Madison, WI. 53708
Plaintiff,

v.
Larry Kallembach
W 8505 Highway 81
Argyle, Wisconsin 53504

Case No. 00-CV-355
Declaratory Judgment: 30701

Marilyn Pearce, Grant County
Register of Deeds, 130 W. Maple St.
Lancaster, WI. 53813
Defendant.

DECLARATORY JUDGMENT AND FINAL ORDER

This matter having come before this court and the Court having been informed:

A. Judgment is entered for the plaintiff declaring:
   (1) That the document filed at Vol. 841 pp. 199 to 205 is a total and complete nullity and has no force or effect.
   (2) That Larry Kallembach is not authorized to describe himself as a "judge" and or a "Private Hearing Officer".

B. Defendant Pearce is hereby enjoined from accepting for filing any documents presented by or on behalf of defendant Kallembach except as are (1) signed by an attorney admitted to practice law in Wisconsin or specifically permitted by order of this court. Defendant Pearce is further enjoined from accepting for filing any document presented bu, on behalf, or in

concert with defendant Kallembach until defendant Kallembach shall first present written proof that he has paid and satisfied all fees and costs allowed in this action and all costs and fees that have been awarded against defendant Kallembach by any other federal or state court.

C. Defendant Kallembach is hereby enjoined from filing any documents purporting to be legal documents or pleadings of any type in any court except as are (1) signed by an attorney admitted to practice law in Wisconsin or specifically permitted by order of this court. Defendant Kallembach is furthered enjoined from filing any document presented by him, on his behalf, or in concert with him, until defendant Kallembach shall first pay and satisfied all fees and costs allowed in this action and all costs and fees that have been awarded against defendant Kallembach by any other federal or state court. This injunction shall apply and extend to any person acting on behalf or in concert with defendant Kallembach.

D. Defendant Kallembach is further ordered to pay all costs in this action and the amount of one thousand dollars ($1,000) as attorney fees under Wis. Stat. Sec. 814.025.

ORDER Judgment is hereby entered as set forth above. This Order for Judgment is intended to be final judgment and order.

Dated this 11th day of December, 2000.

By the Court:

s/ _____

Honorable Robert Van De Hey
Circuit Court Judge

APPENDIX: D-2

"In re June 25, 1948, ch. 646, 62 Stat. 944" "In re May 24, 1949, ch.139, sec. 90, 63 Stat. 102" The supreme court and all courts established by act of congress... in aid ... principles of law.

"In re June 25, 1948, ch. 646, 62 Stat. 928" ... appeal to the supreme court...denying after notice of hearing, an interlocutory or permanent injunction in any civil case action...required by any Act of congress to be heard and determined by a Three-judge court.

"In re sec. 2 of the fourteenth amendment" ... is denied to any male inhabitants of such State... and citizens of the United States, or in any abridged, except for the participation in rebellion, or other crime,...

"In re Pub. L. 93-595, sec. 1 Jan. 2, 1975, 88 Stat. 1930" when mandatory... opportunity to be heard... Time of taking notice. Judicial notice may be taken at any stage of the proceeding.

"In re Pub. L. 93-595, sec. 1 Jan. 2, 1975, 88 Stat. 1931" ...with the evidence to rebut or meet the presumption... which remains throughout the trial upon the party on whom it was originally cast.

"In re treaty of Paris in the (1783) 'Definitive Treaty of Peace' Vol. Statutes at large pg. 80 ratified (1784) article 1" "acknowledges the United States viz the thirteen colonies are free, sovereign and independent States... and relinquishes all claims to the government, property, and territorial rights of the same..."

"In re TWENTY NINTH CONGRESS, SES. I Ch.89. 1846. page 58, section seven (7) of the fifth paragraph (5)" on the condition that... said State shall never interfere with the primary disposal of the soil... and provided that no tax shall be imposed on the lands..."

"In re Public Law, 15 United States at large, Chapter 249, pgs. 223-224 (1868)"; PREAMBLE: "...and whereas it is claimed that such American citizens with their descendants, are subjects of the foreign states, owing allegiance to the

governments thereof ; and whereas it is necessary to the maintenance of public peace that this claim of the foreign allegiance should be promptly and finally disavowed. SECTION I- Right of the expatriation declared. Therefore, Be it enacted by the Senate of the and House of Representatives of the United States of America in the congress assembled, That any declaration, instruction, opinion, order, or decision of any officers of this government which denies, restricts, impairs, or questions by right of the expatriation, is hereby declared inconsistent with the fundamental principles of this government. SECTION: II- Protection to naturalized citizens in the foreign states. And it is further enacted, That all naturalized citizens of the United States, while in the foreign states, shall be entitled to, and shall receive from this government, the same protection of persons and property that is accord to native born citizens in like situations and circumstances.

"In re Nov. 18, 1988, Pub. L. 100-694, sec. 5 and sec. 6, 102 Stat. 4564" ... within the scope of his/her office or employment certified by the attorney general...

"In re article III sec. 2 clause I Constitution of the United States of America" ...between a State and citizens of another State..."

"In re article VI clause 3 Constitution of the United States of America" ...shall be bound by oath or affirmation...

"In re article IV sec. 4 Constitution of the United State of America" ... a republican form of government...

"In re June 25, 1948, ch.646, 62 Stat. 927" "in re Sept. 30, 1978, Pub. L. 95-393, sec. 8 (b), 92 Stat. 810" ... supreme court shall have original jurisdiction ... actions or proceedings by a State against the citizens of another State ...

"In re June 25, 1948, ch. 646, 62 Stat. 964" " In re June 25, 1948, ch.646 Stat. 968" ... except as expressly authorized by Act of congress...

"In re Pub. L. 94-583, sec. 4 (a), Oct. 21, 1976, 90 Stat. 2892" A foreign state shall not be immune from the

jurisdiction of courts of the Untied States... In which the foreign state has waived its immunity either or by implication... In which the action is based upon a commercial activity on in the United States by the foreign state.. see definitions..."agency or instrumentality of a foreign state"

"In re June 25, 1948, ch. 646, 62 Stat. 937" "In re Oct. 21, 1976, Pub. L. 94-583, sec. 6, 90 Stat. 2898" ... founded on a claim or right arising under the constitution, treaties or laws... a **district court shall exclusive jurisdiction** on an ...action brought in State court against a foreign state as defined in section 1603(a) of this title ...

"In re June 25, 1948, ch. 626, 62 Stat. 930" ...district courts shall have original jurisdiction ... Constitution, laws, treaties... controversy exceeds the sum of 75,000 ...State against the citizens of another State...

"In re pub. L. 101-650, title III, sec. 310 9a), Dec. 1, 1990, 104 Stat. 5113" ... district courts shall have supplemental jurisdiction over all other claims that are so related to claims in the action within such original jurisdiction that they form part of the same case or controversy under Article III of the United Sates Constitution...

"In re June 25, 1948, ch. 646,Stat. 944" Defective allegations of jurisdiction may be amended, upon terms, in the trail courts...

"In re Pub. L. 87-748, sec. 1 (a), Oct. 5, 1962, 76 Stat. 744" ...compel an officer or employee of the United States or any agency thereof a duty...

"In re June 25, 1948, ch.646, 62 Stat. 968" "In re Senate Report 94-204" "In re Aug. 12,1976, Pub. L. 94-381 sec. 3,90 Stat. 1119"... injunctive relief ... or when an action is filed challenging the constitutionality of the apportionment of congressional districts...

"In re June 25, 1948, ch.646, 62 Stat.. 1976" Citizens of any foreign government which accords to citizens of the United sates the right to prosecute claims against their

government in its courts may sue...
"In re June 25, 1948, ch. 646, 62 Stat. 933" ... 171(Tort Claims Procedure) of this title, district courts... shall have exclusive jurisdiction... for injury or loss of property... by the negligent or wrongful act or omission of any employee of the Government while acting within the scope of his office or employment... would be liable to the claimant in accordance with the law of the place where the act or omission occurred.
"In re Pub. L. 105-277, title VIII, sec. 801 (a), Oct. 21, 1998,1112 Stat. 2681-118" ...Ethical standards for attorneys for Government... ac Date Act by the act of congress.
"In re Securities Exchange Act of 1934" ... by the exclusive jurisdiction of federal courts... for interstate commerce...
"In re Securities Act of 1933" ...full disclosure ... information...
"In re June 25, 1948, ch.646, 62 Stat. 964" "In re May 24, 1949, ch.139, sec. 112, 63 Stat. 105" "In re Sept. 19, 1966, Pub. L. 89-590, 80 Stat. 811" ...under the color of the authority... He being a citizen of a foreign state... which depend upon the law of nations.
"In re article I sec. 8 clause 3 Constitution of the United states of America" ... regulate Commerce with foreign nations and several states...
"In re June 25, 1948, ch.646 Stat. 931" the district courts shall have original jurisdiction action or proceedings arising under an Act of congress regulating commerce...
"In re sec. 3 of the fourteenth amendment of the Constitution of the United States of America"
(A) "No person shall be a Senator or Representative **[in]** *(i.e. the insurgent feudal lord)* Congress, or elector of President and Vice-President, or hold any office, civil or military, under the "United States" *(de facto federal government)*, or under any "State (federal colony), who:

1. *Having **previously** taken an oath*, as a member **[of]** Congress *(de jure)*, or as an officer of the United

States *(de jure – i.e. feudal Union offices)*, or as a member of any State legislature *(de jure)*, or as executive or judicial officer of any State (de jure), *to support the Constitution of the United States (Union);*

2. **Shall** have engaged in insurrection or rebellion against **the same**; or
3. Given aid or comfort to the enemies thereof. *(enemies of the de jure States)*

(B) But Congress *(acting de jure and/or de facto)* may by a vote of two-thirds of each House, remove such disability. [what disability?]"

"In re article I of the sec. 10 of the Wisconsin constitution on the May 29th , 1848-A.D. nunc pro tunc" ... on the testimony of two witnesses to the same overt act, or on confession in open court

"In re article IV sec. 3 clause I of the Constitution of the United States of America "... no new state shall be formed or erected with the jurisdiction of any other State; nor any State be formed by the junction of two or more States, or Parts of States..."

"In re article I, sec. 4 of the Wisconsin constitution as of May 29th, 1848-A.D." nunc pro tunc "...and to petition the government, for any department thereof..."

"In re article I sec. 9 of the Wisconsin constitition as of the May 29th, 1848-A.D." ... completely and without denial, promptly and without delay..."

"In re article I, sec. 11 of the Wisconsin constitution as of May 29th , 1848-A.D." nunc pro tunc "...supported by oath and affirmation..."

"In re article I, sec. 14 of the Wisconsin constitution as of May 29th , 1848-A.D." nunc pro tunc "...and feudal tenures are prohibited..."

"In re article I, sec. 21 of the Wisconsin constitution as of May 29th, 1848-A.D." nunc pro tunc Writs of error shall never be prohibited by law.

"In re article II, sec. 1 and sec.2 of the Wisconsin

constitution on the May 29th, 1848-A.D." nunc pro tunc "an act to enable the people of Wisconsin territory to form a constitution and state government and for the admission of such state into the union," approved August sixth, one thousand eight hundred and forty-six, to wit: .... An act of congress entitled "... and grant pre-emption rights." Approved September fourth, one thousand eight hundred and forty-one.

"In re June 25, 1948, ch.646 Stat. 944" "The laws of the several states, except where the Constitution or treaties of the United States or Acts of Congress... shall be regarded as rules of decision in civil actions in the courts of the United States, in cases where they apply."

"In re Pub. L. 94-550, sec. 1 (a), Oct. 18, 1976, 90 Stat. 2534" "... executed without the United States: I declare (or certify, verify, or state) under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United states of America that the foregoing is true and correct.

OFFICE OF THE CLERK
Supreme Court of Wisconsin
110 EAST MAIN STREET, SUITE 215
P.O. BOX 1688
MADISON,WI. 53701-1688
TELEPHONE (608) 266-1880

January 29, 2002

To:

Hon. Robert P. VanDeHey
Grant County Courthouse
130 W. Maple Street
Lancaster, WI 53813

Hon. James R. Beer
Green County Circuit Court
1016 16th Avenue
Monroe, WI. 53566

Diane Perkins
Grant County Clerk of Courts
130 W. Maple street
Lancaster, WI. 53813

Carol Thompson
Green County Clerk of Court
1016 16th Avenue
Monroe, WI. 53566

Jeffery J. Scott
Block, Scott & Heenan,LLC
P.O. Box 428
Platteville, WI. 53818-0428

J. Denis Moran
Director of State Courts
P.O. Box 1688
Madison, WI. 53701-1688

Matthew J. Frank
Assistant Attorney General
P.O. Box 7857
Madison, WI. 53707-7857

Marilyn Pearce
Grant CountyRegisterDeeds
130 W. Maple Street
Lancaster, WI. 53813

Jeffery J. Scott
Grant Block, Scott & Heenan,
P.O. Box 424
Platteville, WI. 53818

You are hereby notified that the Court has entered the following order:

Nos. 01-2754-W State ex rel. Kallembach v. Grant County
L.C.#00CV355

01-2755-W State exrel.Kallembach v. Chandler
L.C.#01CV181

APPENDIX: F-1

A petition for supervisory writ pursuant to Wis. Stat. Sec. 809.71 and 809.51 having been filed on behalf of petitoner, state of Wisconsin ex rel. and considered by this court;
IT IS ORDERED that petition for supervisory writ is denied, ex parte.

Cornelia G. Clark
Clerk of Supreme Court

APPENDIX: F-2